



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

MARLOWE'S EDWARD II, Edited by William Dinsmore Briggs, Ph.D. London: David Nutt. 1914. Price 12 s, 6 d, net.

That this edition is the product of long and careful labor would be evident, even without the prefatory explanation that the Introduction to it was first put into form as a Harvard thesis in the year 1900. The text follows that of the Cassel copy of the 1594 edition, the oldest known to be extant. A collation of about a dozen random pages with my facsimile of the Cassel quarto evidences the general trustworthiness of the editing. The occasional deviations which occur (e. g., '*Arun.*' for '*Aru.*', l. 1191; 'senselesse' for 'sencelesse,' l. 1211; '*Arundell,*' for 'Arundell,' l. 1238; 'bloodshed' for 'bloudshed,' l. 1240; 'should' for 'shoulde,' l. 2500; 'Houlborne' for 'Houlburne' in the colophon), though irritating, will hardly seem inexcusable to those who know the difficulty of producing a faultless letter-for-letter reproduction of an Elizabethan volume.

The footnotes, recording variant readings in the later editions, are no less accurate, and they are very full. Indeed, many readers will probably feel that Professor Briggs has given himself meticulous pains in attempting to cite all the textual variations in the many nineteenth-century editions of the play. In about sixteen instances my collations of the early quartos seem to correct or supplement the variants indicated, the most important cases being in l. 107, 182, 370, 1301, 1734, 1870, and 2569. None of these points are of great significance, and it would be disingenuous not to add that Professor Briggs's notes correct those of my preliminary edition in about as many instances. In general no effort is made to indicate the original punctuation or the sporadic use of italic capital letters (e. g., *I* for *I*).

It is on the bibliographical side that students will find most cause to complain of Professor Briggs's text. Unfamiliarity with regular procedure is indicated by his numbering the different pages of each signature of the quarto '1' to '8.' Thus the page of the original which bibliographers would call 'B 2' is confusingly labelled 'B 3,' and 'B 2' of the quarto is called 'B 4.' No account whatever is taken of the catchwords of the original, of the running title, or of the printer's devices which appear on the title page and at the close of the play. Considering the rarity of the first quarto of *Edward II*, of which the only two or three known copies are in isolated libraries, the editor should certainly have made his reprint follow the original page by page. By this means not only would reference from one to the other have been facilitated, but it would have been possible also to reproduce signatures, catchwords, and running title accurately and clearly. In no case should these essential aids to the bibliographer have been utterly ignored. Page for page reprints are perhaps hardly practicable where the greatest economy of space is required or in the case of collective editions based

upon originals differing considerably in size of page (e. g., partly quarto and partly octavo editions); but they are always distinctly desirable. In the present instance, where a single quarto is followed throughout, and the pages of the reprint average about the same number of lines as those of the source, the abandonment of the original pagination can hardly be due to anything but failure to consider the bibliographical as opposed to the textual side of an editor's duty. The same cause doubtless accounts for the absence of all bibliographical information concerning the later quartos of 1598, 1612, and 1622. The reader is not even given to understand which copies of these editions have been employed in the collation, though, in the case of the first at least, it is known that different copies vary in their readings.

The explanatory notes, which occupy about ten per cent more space than the text itself, are not only full, but also in general comprehensive and acute. The citations from Holinshed and the other sources of the play are excellently chosen and introduced in the connections in which they prove most illuminating. The references both to sixteenth-century works and to modern criticism show thorough command of the literature relating to the play, and many of the notes are distinct contributions to the reader's knowledge. Among the happiest are Professor Briggs's discussion of 'The hautie Dane,' etc., in l. 964 and 'lake' in l. 2433. This commentary is indeed the most valuable part of the book, and it will command the respect and gratitude of future students of Marlowe. Small errors seem, however, to be involved in the notes on the following lines: L. 8 (p. 105). It is quite wrong to speak of Marlowe's *Hero and Leander* as 'his translation of a Greek poem long attributed to the old poet Musaeus.' Chapman's translation of the Greek poem, published in 1616, should be compared with the original poem which Marlowe began and Chapman finished (first published in 1598), if one would understand the utter difference between the two works. L. 70 (p. 109). The note fails to explain the syntax. Rather supply 'shall be' before 'puld.' Ll. 71-2 (*ibid.*). Is it a casual slip or is it from forgetfulness of Middle English that Professor Briggs refers to '-th plurals' as belonging to the *Northern* dialect? L. 249 (p. 118). 'His peeres' certainly does not mean the king's peers, as here explained (i. e., holders of one of the five degrees of nobility), but obviously *Gaveston's* peers (equals). L. 307 (p. 122). One can hardly believe that Professor Briggs would have ventured to doubt the wide diffusion of 'the ability to understand spoken Latin,' had he kept in mind the enormous contemporary vogue of academic Latin plays and the popular influence of such works as Udall's 'Floures for Latine speakyng.' L. 675 (p. 130). The note on 'Spare' is certainly wrong. There is no question here of an omitted relative subject as in the alleged parallels cited. 'Spare' is simply an imperative. L. 689 (p. 131) *Octauis*. As the metre shows, this form in the quartos of 1594 and 1598 is certainly a misprint for the

'Octavius' that appears in the later quartos. The accidental omission of the second 'u' is very easily explainable in the case of the printer of 1594, and the compositor of 1598 simply followed 'copy.' (I may perhaps add that my failure to mention this printer's mistake in my preliminary text of the play was not due to failure to note it.) L. 2356 (p. 196). *Suscepi that prouinciam*, etc. The note misses the point. It is not anything supposedly unclassical in the use of the term 'provincia' that Marlowe is 'taking a fling at,' but the hackneyed contemporary employment of the Ciceronian phrase, of which a dozen instances might have been cited. See, for example l. 1134 of the Latin play, *Victoria*, with Moore Smith's comment.

Slight carelessness seems responsible for the employment of modern usage in regard to 'u' and 'v' in passages of text quoted in the notes, where otherwise the spelling of the original is retained. A personal idiosyncrasy appears in the regular spelling of Arundel as 'Arundell.'

Criticism of the long Introduction, in which Professor Briggs sketches the general evolution of the chronicle play, is rather forestalled by the author's modest prefatory remarks. 'Hardly any competent scholar who attentively examines the subject,' he says, 'can fail to discover for himself the principal features of its (the chronicle history's) development. I cannot then pretend to offer to the world any large fund of new information. Nevertheless, I venture to print this account of the growth of an interesting and important species of the drama in the hope that the reader will find it to be at least a useful collection of material.' The sketch is indeed written in a very pleasant style and it shows close study of the extant history plays of Marlowe's generation. The technical student, however, who alone is likely to be drawn to so extensive and critical an edition of a single play, will find the Introduction, in comparison with the rest of the volume, disappointingly 'thesis-y' and general. It contains nothing of consequence concerning Marlowe or *Edward II*. One might well wish that it had been published elsewhere and that its place in the present book had been taken by a more serious effort to answer the particular problems which face an editor of the play; for example: the bibliographical questions connected with the early editions; Marlowe's exact relation to his various sources; the chronological and artistic relationship of *Edward II* to the poet's other works; the technical analysis of style and meter; and the suggestions which the play offers concerning the methods of Elizabethan staging.

TUCKER BROOKE.

Yale University.